DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 442 IR 007 609

AUTHOR Johnson, Mary Frances K.; Hines, Theodore C.
TITLE School Media Programs and Networking: A Position Paper.
PUB DATE Jun 77
NOTE 34p.; For a related document, see ED 168 599

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Consortia; Cooperative Programs; *Library Cooperation; *Library Networks; *School Libraries; *Shared Services; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS Canada

ABSTRACT

This paper prepared for the Task Force on the Role of School Library Media Programs in Networking reviews the role of networking in such programs, lists the objectives of networking for library consortia, and discusses such topics as the benefits and disadvantages of participation in these organizations, prerequisites and criteria for networking, and barriers to cooperation. An analysis of clienteles to be served is also provided, as well as lists of networking relationships and types of networking activities, and a model of the parameters of library consortia. School library participation in networking activities is described for the states of California, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin, and the Calgary (Alberta) Public Library. Recommendations directed to the task force and a 34-item bibliography conclude the report. (RAO)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175442

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCHOOL MEDIA PROGRAMS AND NETWORKING

A Position Paper

by

Mary Frances K. Johnson,
Professor

and

Theodore C. Hines,
Professor and Chairman

Library Science/Educational Technology Division
School of Education
University of North Carolina
at Greensboro

June, 1977

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Theodore C. Hines

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	iii
OBJECTIVES OF NETWORKING	1
THE NEED FOR PARTICIPATION: PROS AND CONS	3
TYPES OF INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION	6
SCHOOL LIBRARY PARTICIPATION IN NETWORKS	11
PREREQUISITES TO PARTICIPATION	17
CRITERIA FOR NETWORKING	18
BARRIERS TO COOPERATION	20
RECOMMENDATIONS	22
BIBLIOGRAPHY	26
APPENDIX ERIC Search (Printout)	29

PREFACE

The Literature

Information sources on which this position paper is based include a search of the ERIC data base (see Appendix) and manual searches of Library Literature (1970-date), Information Science Abstracts, and the Annual Review of Information Science and Technology. In consulting these sources emphasis was placed on reference to school media program participation in networking, interlibrary cooperation, and applications of automation. Additional information was obtained from current reports furnished by staff and members of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) Task Force on the Role of the School Library Media Program in Networking. The general literature on library networking and interlibrary cooperation was also reviewed.

From this review the writers may safely conclude that (1) there is a paucity of published information concerning school libraries and networking, and (2) for those programs that are described in printed sources, the available data lack completeness and/or comparability.

The second (although not the first) of these conclusions is supported by Kraus (17) in his observation that:

> The literature of library cooperation is very large and most of the articles are uncritical. Although most of the cooperative enterprises of libraries are announced and described in library periodicals, there are few evaluative reports that give a clear account of the success of a venture and the factors leading to success or failure. (p. 171)

DeJohn (10) makes a comparable assessment of the literature on multitype library networking: "I don't think any definitive study has been done. One of the problems is reading about these programs getting under way, and then seldom reading whether they are successful." (p. 47) This appraisal clearly applies to much of the published material on school library networking activities, in which the information provided is uneven in depth and frequently lacking in critical evaluation of the operations reported.

It is reasonable to suppose that the small number of publications found pertaining to school library networking reflects the limited participation of school libraries in networking, rather than neglect of the role of school libraries in networking.

A number of indices can be identified by which to test the viability of school library participation in networks. These indices may be grouped, roughly, into four categories:

(1) Professional recommendation. Chief examples include the guidelines provided in the national standards for school media programs (2), and the recommendations made by Shank, in Guide to the Development of Educational Media Selection Centers (31), for a system of special purpose networks at the local, regional, state, and national levels.

(2) Position papers affirming the importance of school media program participation in networking, e.g., Franckowiak (15).

(3) The agenda of library conferences (programs and reports), as well as legislative programs at state and national levels. The literature here is sparse indeed.

(4) Reports of existing and planned programs of networking involving school libraries. As noted above, the literature

identified is limited in scope and depth of coverage.

Definitions

For the purposes of this paper the writers have adhered, generally, to the broad definition of "network" employed by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (24), i.e.:

> Two or more libraries and/or other organizations engaged in a common pattern of information exchange, through communications, for some functional purpose. A network usually consists of a formal arrangement whereby materials, information, and services, provided by a variety of types of libraries and other organizations are made available to all potential users. (Libraries may be in different jurisdictions but agree to serve one another on the same basis as each serves its own constituents. Computers and telecommunications may be among the tools used for facilitating communication among them.) (pp. 82-83)

This definition encompasses activities categorized as "networks" and/or as "consortia," in the sources consulted. A number of sources make a closer distinction between networking activities and other types of interlibrary cooperation, e.g., Miller and Tighe (22), who address their survey of networks to ". . . those resource-sharing activities that employ computer and communications techniques, and to arrangements among several separate and independent institutions." (p. 174)

The terms "school library" and "school media program" are used interchangeably in this paper, reflecting the usage found in the literature.

OBJECTIVES OF NETWORKING

From the general literature on interlibrary cooperation, objectives for library consortia, based on those proposed by Delaney and Cuadra (12), are delineated by Fetterman (14) as follows:

(1) Assist member libraries in the selection of materials

(2) Purchase, catalog, and process library materials

(3) Coordinate cooperative acquisitions, interlibrary loans, and the reproduction of materials for the member libraries

(4) Promote the development of programs for the expanded use of library resources

(5) Stimulate the improvement of library facilities and services

(6) Cooperate in the development of library personnel

(7) Provide, through cooperative acquisition by voluntary agreement, materials beyond the reach of individual libraries

(8) Achieve economies in the use of resources, both human and material

(9) Facilitate sharing of materials among members of the group. (p. 10)

Schwartz (30) asserts that:

> . . . the improvement of the traditional form of library cooperation, i.e., the coordination and interchange of library materials, is rivaled by the importance of new and different types of library cooperation. Illustrative is the need for a coordinated program for continuing education, which updates and revitalizes the librarian's view of user needs, service patterns, and library cooperation. Better coordination of newer formats--such as audiovisual materials, microforms, and computerized data bases--is needed. The applicability of the technologies of computers and telecommunications to user information requirements demands better understanding. (p. 224)

The need for school media program participation in networks is acknowledged in specific terms by Media Programs: District and School (2).

Franckowiak (15) outlines services that regional media programs and/or intertype library consortia can offer individual school and school district media programs, including materials processing, retrieval of information and materials, and library/media staff development. In return, he observes, school media programs can offer to other types of libraries their special expertise in the uses of newer media formats and in the selection, organization, and utilization of the full range of media. DeJohn (10) acknowledges these potential contributions of school media programs to intertype library cooperation (p. 56). Altman's study (1) supports the feasibility and value of interlibrary loans among secondary school libraries of comparable development, as well as the loan of materials from such school libraries to smaller public library units.

THE NEED FOR PARTICIPATION: PROS AND CONS

Schwartz (30) emphsizes the need ". . . to take a critical look at the validity of library cooperation based on the recent increase of user need and demand studies and to determine whether cooperation really has been and will continue to be the key to meeting those needs and demands, based on the information and library needs of users and potential users." (p. 215)

DeJohn (10) notes that "networking is built on mutual trust. You have to be willing to share what you have with others in a spirit of unselfish cooperation, and . . . it's never equal. It's based on the concept of 'what can I do for you,' not, 'what's in it for me.'" (p. 50) He appraises the benefits of networking, to a participating library, as including the following:

(1) Access to greater resources than available in any one library. . .

(2) Freedom from routine processing tasks, (thus) providing (for) more user contact with librarians

(3) Access to special information banks; reference services in depth

(4) Provision of multimedia and learning centers to a greater audience

(5) The interaction with the community in an active way, anticipating services geared to local needs and problems, and discovering where the resources are

(6) Sharing of expertise and unique resources to strengthen the whole. (p. 49)

DeJohn further identifies possible disadvantages of participation in networking as follows:

(1) Networks do require standardization and compatibility. . .

(2) Willing abandonment of self sufficiency and acceptance of a sharing concept

(3) Participation in group decision making and abiding by those decisions

(4) Shifting of some power from local to network

(5) Retraining of staff

(6) A total commitment to (the) network concept. (p. 50)

Needs of school media programs and potential benefits to be derived from participation in networks are projected in the latest recommendations from the American Association of School Librarians' Committee on Networking (28). Needs and potential benefits recognized by the committee include the following:

(1) Access to media: rapid access to high cost, infrequently used, or specialized materials and equipment; awareness of the holdings of other libraries and information agencies; access to sophisticated production facilities; cooperative storage of less-used media

(2) Information services: supplementary reference and referral services; access to a wide range of bibliographic tools, including electronic data bases

(3) Selection: access to examination centers to preview new media; access to a wide range of selection tools

(4) Technical services: access to efficient, high quality centralized cataloging and processing for media in all formats

(5) Personnel: access to specialists and consultants (e.g., design of facilities, security, preservation, production); access to resource persons (e.g., subject area specialists); access to staff development (in-service education) opportunities

(6) Public information and education: public awareness . . . of the school media program's mission, needs, and available resources

(7) Support: broad based support (for) financing, resources, and services.

For each of the seven areas under which school media program needs and potential benefits are grouped above, the committee also identifies (1) strengths and potential contributions offered by school media programs to networks, and (2) recommendations for consideration by participants in network planning at any level.

Feasibility. One question which arises in connection with the development of school library participation in networking is that of technical feasibility, particularly in regard to availability of computing equipment. As far as computers themselves are concerned, computing equipment is or shortly will be available in most school systems in the country, although the suitability of this equipment to particular applications may pose problems. In most communities, however, suitable computers are available in the school district itself, through municipal government, or through some other agency or service bureau.

The cost of computing, including the cost of terminals and other peripherals, is not now high enough to be a deterrent to development of well-designed systems, and these costs are rapidly dropping rather than increasing even in the present period of inflation.

While it cannot be said that data base needs are met as yet, certainly the Annotated Card materials in MaRC (over 30,000 titles), the NICEM data base, and the RIE and CIJE materials available through ERIC constitute substantial resources that have not as yet been sufficiently exploited.

The greatest problem in regard to technical feasibility of school library participation in networking, at present, is probably not lack of necessary equipment, nor cost factors, but rather the lack of trained personnel. This latter problem requires serious consideration.

TYPES OF INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION

Four general types of library consortia, in a statement adapted from Patrick (26), are described by Montgomery (23):

(1) "Large" consortia, which are concerned primarily with computerized, large-scale technical processing. A "large" consortium may comprise a few large scale libraries or a larger number of small libraries often geographically distributed over a state. "Large" consortia seem to be required for long range, large scale projects. The New England Library Information Network (NELINET) and the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) are examples.

(2) Small consortia which are concerned primarily with user services and everyday problems. A characteristic of this type of consortium is geographical proximity which facilitates telephone and face-to-face communication. Smaller consortia provide an opportunity for individual involvement. Projects such as reciprocal borrowing privileges, workshops, specialization of acquisitions, storage, small-scale automation projects, and multimedia projects. An example of this type of consortium is Tri-State College Library Cooperative (TCLS).

(3) Limited-purpose, cooperating with respect to limited special subject areas. Activities here include building special collections, providing reciprocal borrowing privileges, and maintaining union lists. The Consortium of Western Colleges and Universities, headquartered in California, is an example of this type of consortium.

(4) Limited purpose consortia, concerned primarily with interlibrary loan or reference network operations. A state-wide network which facilitates interlibrary loan is an example. (p. 294-95)

A closer analysis of the role of school libraries in networking suggests the following dimensions: (1) clienteles to be served, (2) networking relationships, with respect to types of libraries/other agencies represented and to level (within school district, community, region within the state, state-wide, interstate, and national), and (3) types of networking activities.

Clienteles to be served may include students, faculty, school administrators, parents, community groups and individuals, school boards, and city/county governments (with additional clientele added at regional, state, interstate, and national levels).

Networking relationships possess at least two dimensions, the level of operations and the types of libraries/other agencies participating. Within the single school district, a network may link individual school media centers, centralized professional collections, and/or instructional resource centers whose collections and services augment those of individual school media centers. At the community level, networks may encompass other schools and school districts; public library systems; community college/technical institute learning resources centers; special and other libraries. A similar spread among types of libraries may be represented in some regional networks, whereas other regional networks may serve only school media programs. State-wide networks may add to the mix the state library agency (including any existing networks) and/or state education agencies. Examples of interstate networks applicable to school libraries include OCLC, Solinet, and others. At the national level, existing resources include federally-sponsored data bases, such as MaRC and ERIC; federally-supported special purpose programs such as those sponsored by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Learning Resources Branch (BEH/LRB); and commercial data bases, e.g., Lookheed's DIALOG.

Kraus (17) sorts library cooperative activities into the following broad divisions: (1) interlibrary lending, (2) bibliographical access, (3) specialization agreements, (4) cooperative processing, and (5) organization for cooperation. (p. 171) A more specific listing of school library networking activities would include:

(1) Individual reciprocal borrowing, with return to any network institution

(2) Interlibrary loan and provision of photocopies

(3) Communications and delivery systems, e.g., TTY, facsimile transmission, telephone, mail, United Parcel Service (UPS), and network operated delivery systems

(4) Individual reference and in-library use privileges in all network institutions

(5) Evaluation centers

(6) Centralized bibliographic tools and services, including union lists, directories, newsletters

(7) Cooperative selection and acquisition agreements, e.g., specialization and/or provisions for rotation of some materials

(8) Referral services

(9) Centralized acquisitions

(10) Centralized cataloging and processing

(11) Duplicates exchange

(12) Last copy or little used materials storage

(13) Equipment loan or repair

(14) Cassette, videotape, microfilm, microfiche duplication

(15) Special collections of instructional materials

(16) Computer data base search facilities

(17) Network publicity, public relations, and publication services

(18) In-service education

(19) Consulting services

(20) Staff exchange

A useful model of the parameters of current library consortia is furnished by Montgomery (23), in a model adapted from Patrick (26):

(1) Type

  (a) Member of higher educational consortium

  (b) Independent entity

(2) Area Served

  (a) City

  (b) Region

  (c) State

  (d) Interstate

(3) Headquarters

  (a) Centralized

  (b) Not centralized

(4) Objectives

  (a) Design objectives or goals

(5) Stages of Development

  (a) Planning stage

  (b) Development stage

  (c) Operational stage

(6) Funding Sources

  (a) Dues or fees

  (b) Grants

  (c) Contributed resources

(7) Funding Level (Annual)--usually funds for material or services beyond staff time

(8) Type of Agreement

  (a) Legal

  (b) Informal

(9) Rules for Participation

(a) Specified

(b) Unspecified

(10) Computer Usage

(a) Has computer

(b) Uses university computer

(c) Uses service bureau

(d) Does not use computer

(11) Membership County--simple numeric count of participating members (libraries/agencies)

(12) Activities--list of operational cooperative activities

(13) Direct Services from Headquarters--list of services if different from activities

(14) Leadership

(a) Director or Coordinator

(b) Advisory Board (pp. 290-91)

This model offer a guide for the collection and analysis of baseline data on current network participation of school media programs.

SCHOOL LIBRARY PARTICIPATION IN NETWORKS

Examples of school library participation in networking activities, gleaned from literature searches, are outlined below.

CALIFORNIA

- Los Angeles Unified School District. Automated Instructional Materials Handling System (AIMS)

  Includes materials selection, ordering, control, online film booking, textbook control, and accounting and budgeting functions.

  References: Axford (4); Shank (31)

- California Library Authority for Systems and Services (CLASS)

  Newly formed as a Joint Powers Agreement, to set up a statewide network of services. Includes public and private school libraries.

  Reference: May (21)

ILLINOIS

- The Illinois Library and Information Network (ILLINET)

  ILLINET is composed of local public, academic, special, and school libraries, 18 library systems, 4 reference and research centers, and 3 special resource centers. Extent of and barriers to school library participation are reviewed by Drescher (13).

  References: Bolt (7); DeJohn and Lamont (11); Drescher (13)

- Illinois Valley Library System

  A multitype library cooperative, based in Peoria, which includes public, academic, school, and special libraries. A recent reduction in funding, with planned termination of over-the-counter loans of nonprint materials, is reported by Library Journal (20).

ILLINOIS (continued)

References: Booth (8); Library Journal (20)

. Suburban Library System

An LSCA grant "to hire a liaison consultant for both public and school libraries," who will "concentrate on training personnel in some 300 participating libraries on implementing their own cooperative programs," is reported (19).

Reference: Library Journal

. Wheaton-Warrenville School District

A School-Community Resource Center serves both school and community people, providing access to a photography lab, a TV studio, audio facilities, and a library of educational materials, staffed by trained personnel.

Reference: Library Journal (19)

MARYLAND

.. Montgomery County Schools

Reference data base; to be described by Karen Dowling in an article scheduled for publication in the Fall 1977 issue of School Media Quarterly.

MASSACHUSETTS

. Braintree

The Braintree Librarians and Media Specialists (BLAMS) group, which includes public school, private school, and public library membership, adopted a policy statement acknowledging mutual concerns and dependence, and is organizing cooperative ventures.

Reference: Library Journal (20)

NEW JERSEY

. Burlington County

An LSCA-funded cooperative program activated in September 1976 by selected Burlington County libraries, including high school, public, and county college libraries. Designed to improve service by increasing resource sharing and decreasing

NEW JERSEY (continued)

delivery time. Participating libraries are linked by telephone and teletype service, with van delivery service.

Reference: School Media Quarterly (29).

NEW YORK

. Levittown Public Library

Provision of professional education materials for school district faculty.

Reference: Reported by Theodore C. Hines

. Rockland County

"A new library-media center at Rockland Community College houses the Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) communications media service as well as the college's audio-visual service," and serves both the college and the eight county school districts. Services include a film library (3,000 titles), reading resources center, materials production, and communications media planning and development (32).

Reference: Wilkins (32)

. Scarsdale Public Schools

Computerized union list of periodicals: school and public library.

Reference: Reported by Theodore C. Hines

NORTH CAROLINA

. University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Work is proceeding on a prototype data base of data on children's materials at the elementary school level, expected to include all recommended basic titles in all media except 16mm film by 1979.

OREGON

. Oregon Total Information System (OTIS), Eugene

An article by Nicola Laird, describing the OTIS career information data base, is scheduled for publication in the Fall 1977 issue of School Media Quarterly.

OREGON (continued)

References (general): Axford (4); Blair and Snyder (6)

. OTIS Automated Library Services (OALS)

Catalog production, ordering, processing, evaluation of media, online booking and scheduling, ERIC computer searching, and textbook control functions.

Reference: Axford (4)

. Project LEEDS, Springfield Public Schools

Combined the demonstration of the Springfield Public Schools' existing library program and a feasibility study of an automated library system for acquisitions, cataloging, and processing of materials.

Reference: Blair and Snyder (6)

PENNSYLVANIA

. Coraopolis, Pennsylvania

Computerized listing of all audiovisual media formats owned by district schools, to facilitate interlibrary loan.

Reference: Reported by Blanche Woolls

UTAH

. Utah State Library Commission

The Commission's Technical Services Division has expanded its purchasing and processing service to include all public school media centers in the state.

Reference: Library Journal (19)

WASHINGTON (STATE)

. Washington Library Network (WLN)

School participation in this network is to be described in an article by Audrey Kolb and Jo Morse scheduled for publication in the Fall 1977 issue of School Media Quarterly.

Reference (general): Purdy (27)

WISCONSIN

- Intertype Library Councils (4)

  Non-profit educational corporations with tax-exempt status. Membership includes libraries of all types: academic, special, public, and school.

  Reference: Branson (9)

- Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs)

  Intermediate educational service units; functions vary.

  Reference: Branson (9)

- University of Wisconsin-River Falls Tri-County Cooperative Film Library

  Serves a university and eleven area public school districts.

  Reference: Krueger (18)

CANADA

- Calgary Public Library

  Educational Reference service for teachers, including table of contents service, is provided by the public library and funded by the school system.

  Reference: Reported by Theodore C. Hines

Augmenting this list of local, regional, and intra-state networking activities in which school media programs participate is the example of nationwide media and materials support services offered by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Learning Resources Branch (BEH/LRB), whose network is described in an issue of Apropos (3):

> The National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped (NCEMMH) is a major unit within the learning resources program. In addition to NCEMMH, there are four Specialized Offices (SO's) and thirteen Area Learning Resource Centers (ALRCs). NCEMMH and the four specialized offices have national roles and responsibilities, while the thirteen ALRC's have regionalized roles and responsibilities. This program, collectively referred to as the ALRC/SO/NCEMMH network, complements a separate but related BEH/LRB program of regional resource centers which have a mission related to identification of, educational diagnosis of, and prescription for handicapped students.

The ALRC/SO/NCEMMH program is designed to interface with state and local media-materials programs and to provide supportive services to those programs so that the following general goals may be achieved:

(1) Where appropriate materials do not exist to meet the needs of handicapped students--needed materials can be made available through adaptation/modification of existing materials and/or development of new materials to meet identified student needs.

(2) Where users of materials are not aware of existing materials that will meet the needs of the handicapped--information about relevant and usable materials and media will be made available to the potential user.

(3) Where users know about the availability of existing materials that will meet needs of handicapped students, but do not have physical access to these materials--materials will be made accessible on a convenient basis.

(4) Where materials are accessible but the potential user does not know how to use them effectively--users will have access to information and assistance in the use of materials.

The brevity of this listing reflects the limited information available in the literature, as indicated in the Preface.

Young (34) identifies fifteen states reporting on single and multi-type library systems, networks, and consortia involving schools, from the recent ALSA Report on Interlibrary Cooperation: California, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Blanche Woolls (33) surveyed state library agency staff attending the NCLIS Management Institute for State Librarians, held at the University of Pittsburgh in March 1977, asking (1) whether school libraries are a part of networks in the respondent's state and (2) what are viewed as the major problems in involving school libraries in networking. Fourteen respondents stated that school libraries are included in networks in their states; two gave a qualified "yes"; seven replied "no"; the remainder (number not stated) gave no reply.

PREREQUISITES TO PARTICIPATION

Fetterman (14) cites the 1967 joint statement on interlibrary cooperation approved by the boards of directors of ACRL, AASL, PLA, and ASLA, in which the following prerequisites to fruitful interlibrary cooperation were identified:

(1) That primary responsibility of each type of library to its special clientele must be identified before interlibrary cooperation can be established to augment service;

(2) That effective cooperation depends upon adequate resources, administrative capability, and efficient communications;

(3) That although the primary responsibility of each library must be respected, each library must realize its responsibilities to the network and assume its appropriate share of responsibilities;

(4) That all libraries must maintain an attitude of flexibility and experimentation.

Franckowiak (16) emphasizes the necessity for strong media programs at the individual school and district levels, as the "primary libraries" for students and teachers, as well as the lag in acceptance by schools of the concept that these libraries, however good, cannot be self-sufficient. He observes that "the idea of networking has thus far tended to be an informal kind of arrangement to get something from somebody else who happens to have it, rather than making a concerted effort to develop a systematic way of transferring materials and finding out what others have, reaching beyond the building level for the resources that are needed." (p. 67)

CRITERIA FOR NETWORKING

Becker and Olsen (5), as cited by Shank (31), identify four characteristics of an ideal network:

> (1) Formal Organization. Many units sharing a common information purpose recognize the value of group affiliation and enter into a compact.
>
> (2) Communications. The network includes circuits that rapidly interconnect dispersed points.
>
> (3) Bi-directional Operation. Information may move in either direction, and provision is made for each network participant to send as well as receive.
>
> (4) A Directory and Switching Capability. A directory look-up system enables a participant to identify the unit most able to satisfy a particular request. A switching center then routes messages to the unit over the optimum communications path. (pp. 290-91)

Purdy (27) identifies "some major conditions of successful interlibrary cooperation between libraries with differing missions and different clienteles," including: (1) "the attitude of the people involved," (2) "the reciprocity requirement": the desire and need for equity, a concept which is challenged by DeJohn (10), (3) the need for formal machinery, "ideally involving something in the nature of a secretariat," (4) the value of propinquity, (5) the imperative for sound planning, and (6) the need for funds to stimulate and implement cooperative programs. (pp. 114-15)

Wilkins (32), in describing the cooperative program of the Rockland Community College and the Rockland County Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Suffern, New York, reports: "We have learned that supervision

must be by a single authority who is responsible for all operating decisions. That supervisor is subject, in turn, to the policy constraints of the cooperating agencies." (p. 18)

Schwartz (30) emphasizes the criterion of responsiveness to identified user needs, calling attention to the findings of the NCLIS conference on user needs held in Denver in May 1973: For all user groups whose needs were analyzed, "two factors which remained consistent were the importance of time and the usability of format." (p. 221)

BARRIERS TO COOPERATION

There is widespread agreement in the literature that the major obstacle to participation in networks lies in the attitudes of librarians, as well as the attitudes of (some) library users. Fetterman (14) states the case emphatically: "It is critical at this point to face the issue head-on. The obstacles to resource sharing are no longer inherent in technology, but in people." (p. 12)

Barriers to cooperation identified by participants in a series of meetings sponsored by the American Library Association in 1968, originally summarized by Nolting (25), are quoted in Fetterman's survey of the rationale for resource sharing (14):

(1) Psychological barriers--fear of loss of local autonomy, clash of personalities, inertia and indifference, unwillingness to experiment, etc.

(2) Lack of information and experience--lack of knowledge of the needs of users, unpredictability of demands on the library by its legitimate users, failure of small libraries to realize the value of resources of larger cooperative efforts in other states

(3) Traditional and historical barriers--lack of adequate funds, fear of large libraries of being overused and undercompensated, inadequacy of libraries to serve their own needs, limitations on access to academic and special libraries, institutional competition between school and public libraries

(4) Physical and geographical barriers--distance between libraries and distance of users from libraries, difference in size of collections, lack of space in public libraries to serve students delays in satisfying needs and requests of users

(5) Legal and administrative barriers--too many governmental units, lack of communication across jurisdictional lines, lack of bibliographical tools and controls, incompatibility of equipment and procedures and rules between libraries, lack of properly trained staff, lack of appropriate state-enabling legislation, lack of creative administrative leadership, etc. (pp. 13-14)

Among the barriers listed in this summary, Schwartz (30) underscores the gaps in knowledge of user needs; Franckowiak (15) calls attention to the prevailing failure to accept the student as a full citizen, with equal right to resources and services, as well as the lack of adequate community and state-level coordination.

Drescher's analysis (13) of school library cooperation in ILLINET identifies similar barriers to full school participation in this state network. Comparable statements were made by state library agency staff who responded to Woolls' survey (33). The lack of strong leadership and initiative by state agencies is scored in a recent report on the failure of efforts to achieve state-wide cooperation in Hawaii (20).

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is apparent, indeed, that school libraries lag behind other types of libraries in the extent of their participation in networking activities.

Franckowiak's earlier position paper (15) presents a set of cogent basic recommendations that merit further consideration by the National Commission and its Task Force on the Role of the School Library Media Program in Networking.

The writers offer the following recommendations for Task Force efforts:

(1) A concerted effort should be made to identify networking activities not reported in the existing literature.

(2) Existing networks should be surveyed, wherever possible, to collect baseline data. The model described by Montgomery (23) could be used or adapted for this purpose, in order to obtain consistent information on network examples. Few cases were found in which the literature provided more than cursory descriptions of networking activities; still fewer descriptions included critical analysis of the network's effectiveness. Direct query appears to be necessary to obtain baseline information on operating networks, and may serve also to screen out those in which school library participation is largely theoretical rather than real.

(3) Consideration should be given to a real attempt to evaluate representative networking programs. Various possibilities may be considered for such a project: evaluation conducted by NCLIS Task Force members; cooperation with AASL and its Committee on Networking; research by library school faculty/students; co-sponsorship of funded research; and employment of contractual services.

(4) Efforts should be made to encourage publication of information needed to extend awareness of, interest in, support for, and knowledge about the role of school media programs in networking, with school media personnel as the primary audience. The forthcoming (Fall 1977) issue of School Media Quarterly offers an example of what is needed. Information obtained by further efforts to identify and survey existing networks should be available to support both "awareness" and more formal continuing education efforts, discussed below. More "how-to" information on technology and on essential elements in planning, addressed to the grass roots level, is needed to combat attitudinal barriers.

(5) Priority should be given to a broadly based "awareness" program addressed to professional school media personnel at individual school, district, regional, and state levels, to create/extend awareness of and arouse interest in the potential of networking activities.

Activities suggested above for provision of information should support such an "awareness" program.

Consideration should be given also to the need for interpreting to librarians in other types of libraries the contributions offered by school library participation in networks.

(6) Major emphasis should be given to the identification of particular needs, funding sources, sponsoring groups, and design of in-service education opportunities for school media personnel.

In-service education programs, broadly construed, are essential to such goals as acceptance of the concept that no single library can be self-sufficient; recognition of the reciprocal contributions of networking; understanding of characteristics of effective networks; knowledge of essential technological capabilities and organizational features; and competency in analyzing users' needs and in systematic planning.

Consideration of delivery systems for continuing education programs should take into account the levels at which in-service education activities are needed (national, interstate, state, region, district, community); agencies which can participate in the provision of such activities (e.g., professional associations, state education and library agencies, regional centers, districts and communities, library education programs); and sources of support which may be tapped to support design and implementation of continuing education programs. Recognition should be given to the need (both real and symbolic) for library cooperation among types of libraries in continuing education.

Information may be obtained from review of efforts such as the ISAD/AASL regional workshops on school library automation, ERIC workshops, the MaRC project institutes for participating library staffs, and the Cataloging in Publication (CIP) workshops cosponsored by the Association of American Publishers and the Library of Congress. The role of CLENE should be considered.

The NCLIS study of the feasibility and desirable characteristics of a national data base for nonprint materials has clear and important implications for school library networking. Findings of this study may provide an effective vehicle for continuing education programs.

Possible approaches for the NCLIS Task Force on the Role of the School Library Media Program in Networking include the development of guidelines for planning in-service programs on school library participation in networking; identification of program resources (human and material); and exploration of sources of funding and planning support for continuing education programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Altman, Ellen O. "The Resource Capability of Public Secondary School Libraries to Support Interlibrary Loan: A Systems Approach to Title Diversity and Collection Overlap" (Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1971).

2. American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology. Media Programs: District and School. Chicago: American Library Association; Washington, D.C.: Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1975.

3. Apropos; a publication of the National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped. September 1975.

4. Axford, H. William, ed. Proceedings of the LARC Institute on Automation of Libraries in School Systems (Pomona, Calif., September 27-28, 1973). Tempe, Ariz.: The LARC Association, 1973.

5. Becker, Joseph, and Olsen, Wallace C. "Information Networks." In Annual Review of Library and Information Science and Technology. Ed. by Carlos Cuadra. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1968.

6. Blair, John R., and Snyder, Ruby. "An Automated Library System: Project LEEDS," American Libraries, 1(February 1970): 172-73.

7. Bolt, Janice, ed. School Media Services: Copyright/Cooperation. Arlington, VA.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 129 214, 1976.

8. Booth, Barry. "The Illinois Valley Library System." In Futurism and School Media Development, pp. 59-65. Ed. by Marilyn L. Miller and Alida Geppert. Kalamazoo, Mich.: School of Librarianship, Western Michigan University, 1975.

9. Branson, Peg. "Description of Cooperative Activities in Wisconsin," January 1976.

10. DeJohn, William. "Networking and School Media Development." In Futurism and School Media Development, pp. 45-58. Ed. by Marilyn L. Miller and Alida L. Geppert. Kalamazoo, Mich.: School of Librarianship, Western Michigan University, 1975.

11. DeJohn, William E., and Lamont, Bridget L. "The Multitype Library Network," Illinois Libraries 57 (June 1975): 363-67.

12. Delaney, Diana, and Cuadra, Carlos. Directory of Academic Library Consortia. Santa Monica, Calif.: System Development Corp., 1972.

13. Drescher, Robert A. "School Library Cooperation in the Illinois Library and Information Network (ILLINET)," Illinois Libraries 58 (September 1976): 548-51.

14. Fetterman, John. "Resource Sharing in Libraries--Why?" In Resource Sharing in Libraries: Why, How, When, Next Action Steps, pp. 1-33. Ed. by Allen Kent. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1974.

15. Franckowiak, Bernard M. School Library Media Programs and the National Program for Library and Information Services. (NCLIS Related Paper, No. 7) Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 100 393, 1974.

16. Franckowiak, Bernard. "School Media Programs and Networking." In Futurism and School Media Development, pp. 66-76. Ed. by Marilyn L. Miller and Alida L. Geppert. Kalamazoo, Mich.: School of Librarianship, Western Michigan University, 1975.

17. Kraus, Joe W. "Prologue to Library Cooperation," Library Trends 24 (October 1975): 169-81.

18. Krueger, Robert B. "These Schools Rent Films for 75¢ per Title!" Audiovisual Instruction 22 (January 1977): 19.

19. Library Journal 101 (May 15, 1976): 1173.

20. Library Journal 102 (June 15, 1977): 1335.

21. May, James H. California State College Library, Rohnert Park, California. Interview, 28 June 1977.

22. Miller, Ronald F., and Tighe, Ruth L. "Library and Information Networks. In Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, vol. 9. Ed. by Carlos A. Cuadra. Washington, D.C.: American Society for Information Science, 1974.

23. Montgomery, K. Leon. "Resource Sharing in Libraries--The Next Step." In Resource Sharing in Libraries: Why, How, When, Next Action Steps, pp. 289-366. Ed. by Allen Kent. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1974.

24. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Toward a National Program for Library and Information Services: Goals for Action. Washington, D.C. The Commission, 1975.

25. Nolting, Orin F. "Mobilizing Total Library Resources for Effective Service." Chicago: American Library Association, 1969.

26. Patrick, Ruth J. Guidelines for Library Cooperation: Development of Academic Library Consortia. Santa Monica, Calif.: System Development Corp., 1972.

27. Purdy, G. Flint. "Interrelations Among Public, School, and Academic Libraries. In Reader in Library Cooperation. Ed. by Michael M. Reynolds. Washington, D.C.: NCR Microcard Editions, 1972; first published in Library Quarterly 39 (1969): 52-63.

28. "The Role of the School Media Program in Networks and Interlibrary Cooperation." Committee on Networking, American Association of School Librarians (June 1977).

29. School Media Quarterly 5 (Summer 1977): 243-44.

30. Schwartz, Roderick G. "The Need for Cooperation Among Libraries in the United States," Library Trends 24 (October 1975): 215-27.

31. Shank, Russell. "Networks." In Guide to the Development of Educational Media Selection Center, pp. 68-87. Ed. by Cora Paul Bomar and others. (ALA Studies in Librarianship, No. 4) Chicago: American Library Association, 1973.

32. Wilkins, Robert D. "A Mediated Affair," Audiovisual Instruction 22 (January 1977): 18.

33. Woolls, Blanche. School of Library and Information Science, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (March 1977).

34. Young, Christina Carr. "Memo." Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, May 20, 1977.